



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,385	06/26/2001	Dennis G. Thibedeau	10473-784	9489

7590 08/05/2003

McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

HE, AMY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2858

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/888,385	THIBEDEAU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Amy He	2858

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 16, 17, 23 and 24 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4, 9-15 and 18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 5-8 and 19-22 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 4, 9-10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suganuma et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 029, 512).

Referring to claim 1, Suganuma discloses a method for evaluating operation of an alternator comprising:

detecting a frequency component (ripple frequency) of an rectified alternator output signal (column 5, lines 16-17; lines 55-65);
comparing the frequency component (the rotational speed of the alternator that is directly proportional to the ripple frequency of the alternator output) of the alternator output signal with a threshold frequency component (the rotational speed of the engine which can be represented by a frequency also , column 5, lines 55-65); and

evaluating operation of the alternator (the slip of the driving belt, column 5, lines 61-65) based on a result of the comparing step .

Suganuma does not specifically disclose comparing the ripple frequency with a threshold frequency. Instead, Alternatively, Suganuma discloses comparing, the alternator speed representative of the ripple frequency, with the

rotational speed that represents the threshold frequency. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would find it obvious to modify Suganuma to compare ripple frequency with threshold frequency instead of comparing alternator speed with engine speed as a matter of obvious design choice, since choosing to do so does not change the function of the alternator tester for detecting the operation of the alternator.

Referring to claims 4 and 18, Suganuma discloses a system for evaluating the operation of an alternator comprising:

a terminal/means (3b in Figure 1) for receiving an alternator output signal representative of an output of the alternator;

a frequency detection device/means (35) for detecting a frequency component of the alternator output signal;

a controller/means (comparator in Figure 2) for comparing the frequency component (alternator speed) of the alternator output signal to a threshold frequency component (the engine speed), and indicating the operation of the alternator (i.e. the slip of the driving belt).

Suganuma does not specifically disclose comparing with a threshold frequency. A person of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to modify Suganuma to compare with a threshold frequency, for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

In addition, Suganuma does not disclose an indication device for indicating the operation of the alternator. However, choosing to include an indication device is merely a matter of obvious design choice. A person of

ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to modify Saganuma to include an indication device, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known tool for a known purpose on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA).

Referring to claim 9, Saganuma discloses the system of claim 4, wherein the alternator output signal is the voltage generated by the alternator (see abstract).

Referring to claim 10, Saganuma discloses the system of claim 4, wherein the alternator is installed in an automotive vehicle and driven by the engine of the automotive vehicle (see Figure 1).

2. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saganuma et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,029,512), in view of Sievers et al. (U.S. Patent No: 4, 379, 990).

Referring to claim 2, Saganuma discloses the method of claim 1. Saganuma does not disclose maintaining the rotational speed of the alternator at a predetermined level before detecting the frequency component of the alternator output signal.

Sievers suggests that if the alternator rotational speed is too low, it may cause an inaccurate detection (column 14, lines 62-66).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saganuma to maintain the alternator

rotation speed above a certain threshold value, as suggested by Sievers, so as to measure the frequency component more accurately.

Referring to claim 3, Saganuma discloses the method of claim 1, wherein if the frequency component is smaller than the threshold frequency component, the alternator is determined as defective (i.e. driving belt slip detected).

3. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saganuma et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 029, 512), in view of Sievers et al. (U.S. Patent No: 4, 379, 990), as applied to claims 4 and 10 above, and further in view of Bertness (U.S. Patent No: 6,331,762).

Referring to claims 11, 12 and 14, Saganuma in view of Sievers discloses the system of claim 10. Saganuma in view of Sievers does not disclose a database, accessible by the controller, including threshold frequencies corresponding to more than one vehicle model, as well as threshold frequencies corresponding to more than one engine or alternator rotational speeds.

Bertness discloses a database/memory (memory 40), accessible by the controller (microprocessor 12 or 22), which could be used to store various threshold corresponding to more than one vehicle model, as well as various engine or motor rotational speeds (column 9, lines 54-66; column 8, lines 1-10; column 11, lines 23-30; column 13, lines 23-26; lines 44-49).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Saganuma, as modified by Sievers, to use a database, accessible by the controller, including threshold

frequencies corresponding to more than one vehicle model, as well as threshold frequencies corresponding to more than one engine or alternator rotational speed, so that the alternator tester could be used for different vehicle models, different engine or alternator speed.

Referring to claims 13 and 15, Suganuma in view of Sievers discloses the system of claims 4 and 10, except for an alternator output signal received from a vehicle computer, or a data processing system.

Bertness discloses an alternator output signal, received from a vehicle computer, or a data processing system, installed on the automotive vehicle (the microprocessor, column 15, claim 9).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Suganuma in view of Sievers to obtain an alternator output signal from a vehicle computer installed on the automotive, as taught by Bertness, to improve efficiency of the evaluation.

Response to Arguments

4. The finality of the last office action dated April 25, 2003 is withdrawn.
5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 5-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claim 4), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2858

7. Claims 16-17 and 23-24 are allowed.
8. Claims 19-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claim 18), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy He whose telephone number is (703) 305-3360. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, N. Le can be reached on (703) 308-0750.

The official Fax numbers for the organization are (703-872-9318) Before-Final and (703-872-9319) After-Final Office actions. Any inquiry of a general nature relating to this application should be directed to the receptionist at (703) 305-4900.

AH
AH
July 24, 2003


N. Le
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800